

MARCH 3RD, 2022  
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE, REVENUE, AND BONDING

TESTIMONY OF DAVID GODBOUT

Objection to all bills

Written testimony

via email [d\\_godbout1@hotmail.com](mailto:d_godbout1@hotmail.com)

**OBJECTION TO SENATE BILLS: 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, 59**  
**OBJECTION TO HOUSE BILLS: 5010, 5016, 5094, 5103**

### **SENATE BILL 21 – NEW STATE PROPERTY TAX – OPPOSED – SEN. LOONEY IS LYING TO US**

Sen. Looney, of 123 Fort Hale Rd., New Haven, CT 06512, tel. 203-468-8829, is the only one who wants this bill passed; I'm sure he would like citizens and residents to let them know their opinions. As we cannot visit his offices, as he is holed up in his mansion or office, I'm certain he would still like people to visit him at his house or call him directly to tell him what a great job he is doing or otherwise.

I and many other people in the state have not been members of the general assembly, taking kickbacks and political favors to make such a tax easy to absorb.

Instead, over time, this new property tax (which has no sunset provision in it, although it notes a specific court case settlement that its purpose is for and, therefore, easily calculable, and able to be included in the bill, which it does not) will cost individuals like me and many more thousands of dollars.

Want to send your kid to higher education, forget about it, crazy Looney wants property tax from you !

The purpose of the bill is to pay for costs associated with the Sheff v. O'Neill lawsuit. This lawsuit basically was about democrats running big towns and cities who decided to line their pockets as opposed to putting money into schools. The case is about 20 years or older now.

Before Reconstruction in the late 1800's it was the democrats that fought to maintain a system that included slavery. After Reconstruction, it was democrats who made black Americans 3/5ths of a person. And even recently, it has been democrats who do not want black Americans to be able to exercise their rights.

It was democrats that burned down the mostly Black Wall Street community.

The actions of democrats speak louder than their words. During Reconstruction and afterwards, places controlled by democrats did not allow black Americans to own guns. I asked a big city mayor of one of the largest cities in the USA why he was pushing for all these gun control laws recently. The response "To keep guns outta of the hands of n---gers." This was not surprising as almost all gun laws are aimed at either making it impossible for black Americans to own firearms or to keep tabs on those who do. Governor Malloy when asked why he wanted to maintain a list of gun owners responded that he wanted the police, when responding to even noise complaints, to respond with overwhelming force when responding to police calls. He clearly implied that the gun registration laws were aimed at black Americans. When a gun is sold by a Licensed Firearms Dealer (FFL), the dealer is supposed to send paperwork to the state informing the state of who the gun was sold to and the gun sold via completion of the DPS-3 form. Under federal law, the paperwork completed by the FFL (an ATF 4473 form) is kept by the FFL and then destroyed by the dealer after a period of time. The state's DPS-3 form was created for the specific purpose of to keep track of guns that black Americans purchased.

Two noise complaints are taken by the police of two different residences, they check to see if a gun owner is at any of the properties; both show up on their search for this information in the affirmative. One residence is occupied by a black family and the other a Jewish family. Guess which one gets the higher likelihood of having police come with their guns drawn? Not the Jewish household.

In regards to education, the focus of the Sheff v. O'Neill lawsuit regarding poor education of black Americans, almost all in towns and cities that democrats controlled, like the town of New Haven where Sen. Looney lived during the time periods before and after the lawsuit, the democrats decided that the education of the children in their jurisdiction was not a high priority, as the democratic politicians could count on the votes of the black community in any event. I cannot find any New Haven Board of Ed. Meeting minutes where Sen. Looney spoke up in favor of providing better resources of the town for educating their black families and students.

Indeed, as noted in the report from the Office of Legislative Research, found here : <https://www.cga.ct.gov/ps96/rpt/olr/htm/96-r-0992.htm> , and the legislative history Sen. Looney supported the state position that the lawsuit had no merit and should have been dismissed.

Now Sen. Looney wants to institute a state wide property tax. A tax without end. A tax that will only be increased. A tax that owners of property will have to pay to keep their property. Today the bill notes its limited to residential real property, tomorrow it will be a property tax on the food you buy and you will have to prove you have eaten it to be free from the tax. Citizens buy stuff, its our property, why do we have to pay a tax to the state to still be able to enjoy what we have already paid for; isn't that what our property rights are ? That one cannot have the property taken away by the state? Article 1, Section 11 of our state constitution recognizes our property rights.

Sen. Looney is telling lies ! The purpose listed is not his purpose. His purpose is simply to steal from us. How do we know this ? The Sheff v. O'Neill case was decided in the 1990s ! The cost associated with the settlement related to the case is well known to Sen. Looney. Yet no sunset provision is noted in the bill. So, if one wants to crazily think that the reason Sen. Looney gave is his actual reason (which it is not), then there would be a sunset time period, even if for an estimated amount of funds needed related to the settlement. Instead it goes forever.

And what Sen. Looney does not tell you in the bill is that funds, since the 1990s, have been spent to achieve the goals of the settlement. Few dollars are needed anymore. Instead he wants to create a state-wide property tax that will continue forever and will only become more burdensome over time.

Instead, a citizen is best guided by this rule : Everything Sen. Looney says is a lie.

He introduces a bill and then runs and hides in his offices that he closes off to the public. Or he is underground in a little hiding hole, no one knows for sure. One thing is for sure. Sen. Looney is a liar.

#### **GENERAL ASSEMBLY WILL NOT PROCEED TO COMPLETE LAWMAKING PROCESS IN ACCORDANCE WITH CONSTITUTIONAL MANDATES OBJECTION TO ALL BILLS LISTED ABOVE**

Article 3, Section 16 of our State Constitution requires the general assembly to meet in public, as the section states:

**SEC. 16. The debates of each house shall be public, except on such occasions as in the opinion of the house may require secrecy.**

The general assembly currently is, as it has been for two years, meeting behind closed doors without the sessions being conducted in public. Currently the general assembly web site notes that the public cannot enter the session chamber's public seating areas, noting:

**The Capitol and LOB are open to the public during regular business hours. Public access is limited to the first floors of each building.**

There is no exception to the requirement that sessions of the general assembly be open to the public except for secrecy. A pandemic is not an issue related to secrecy but the general assembly.

The Connecticut Public Affairs Network, Inc. (aka CT-N) has a contract to broadcast what they may capture to their website and elsewhere. The CT-N broadcast and what is broadcast by CT-N is completely controlled by the general assembly through the contract that the company entered into with the state. The contract consists of two parts, a main contract and an amendment. For the 2021 contract you can find the two parts (72 pages for the first main contract and 5 pages for the second) . One may request a copy of the 2021 or 2022 contracts, which has the same terms, from the Office of Legislative Management, phone # 860-240-0100.

Never has a CT-N broadcast been considered to be a thing that meets the "public" requirement of the general assembly to meet in public as required by Article 3<sup>rd</sup>, Section 16 of state constitution. If it did or does then the current way of conducting sessions will be the way it will be done. Even when the constitutional provision was written, in 1818, the technology did not exist and the people who created the constitution meant personal attendance as being required for the public. The lack of public attendance, when required by law, has always resulted in the voiding of the actions taken during the nonconforming activity. Even the contract between CT-N and the state shows that the state wishes to hide the activities of the general assembly and only allows the CT-N company to catch very specific things. If a "sell your vote booth" was on the floor of the general assembly, CT-N would not be allowed to show it due to the severe and strict limitations upon CT-N as to what they can broadcast. The CT-N broadcast is more akin to what the North Korean government shows of its legislators as opposed to a free country.

The general assembly is not conducting its sessions in public and such activity is automatically void. The general assembly could meet and allow the public to view but has decided, instead, to provide citizens and residents a one square foot picture via CT-N broadcast and most human communication is displayed by body language, not spoken words.

Our elected officials don't care. They think a virus being in the environment, an environment that always contains pathogens, is reason enough to squash any and all rights. But the general assembly did not create our rights; they have zero authority to regulate them. The role of government is to protect citizens' rights but this general assembly seems to think it's just the opposite.

The committee and its members clearly approve of a general assembly acting in a manner that voids everything it has done in the past two years and going forward. Citizens should simply nullify the illegal actions taken by the state.

### **COMMITTEE RULES REQUIRE CITIZENS TO TOSS ASIDE 4TH AMENDMENT RIGHTS OBJECTION TO ALL BILLS LISTED ABOVE**

This committee now demands that people who wish to testify toss aside their Fourth Amendment rights. The Fourth Amendment requires the government to have a warrant to enter your house, either physically or electronically through means such as microphone or camera electronic devices.

Today, this committee will allow those to provide in-person testimony. But only through either a Zoom electronic process or through telephonic means.

Most people would need to do this in their homes. Not all people have cellphones or internet connections outside their homes. And where outside their homes would people participate via cellphone, in the outside with winds, rains, snow, etc upon them ?

Many people don't have computers needed to participate via Zoom or internet connectivity. Leaving this large group of citizens with a telephone option.

Not all people have telephones, I have lived years without any telephone service, it was a choice.

But for people who can participate via Zoom or telephone from their homes, can they be required to do so ? Many are now required to let the state into their homes, the place where the Fourth Amendment and the right to be free from government access into their homes to be sacrosanct. The agenda of the committee is clear enough, if one wishes to give personal testimony then they MUST allow the government into their homes without a warrant.

When I contacted the committee about this issue the committee representative stated that with Zoom, one can cancel the video part and only leaving on the audio part functioning. However, this still leaves the state with an active microphone in operation even if for the time period on only is speaking to the committee. It still is a microphone that the state is requiring to be on, active, and that the state is able to listen to and record, collecting information that can be used against in person in court. Many people have been arrested during their Zoom use when dealing with governmental bodies due to something that the government heard or saw. This is not theoretical, it has happened and will continue to happen.

In Connecticut Superior Courts today if one has a court proceeding scheduled for a day, the court provides a room at the courthouse so one can participate in the proceeding without the need for the government to require the proceeding participant to attend via a Zoom or similar method from their home. The courts have already recognized the Fourth Amendment violations that are similar to what the committee now requires citizens who wish to give testimony.

And in a case that was pending in case HHB-CV17-6037383-S, Judge Cordani detailed, in his ruling on a motion, docket entry 144.00 of the case, how the public may view proceedings of the court without the need to allow the state into a person's home noting:

In this matter, if the petitioner would like to observe the proceedings, the petitioner may observe them from the public gallery of the courtroom. The judge and the clerk will be present in the courtroom, but the parties attend virtually. The petitioner may observe, but not participate in the proceedings, provided the normal rules of courtroom decorum are followed

Judge Cordini , order issued 17 JUL 2020

So in the Superior Courts of the state, people are not required to participate wherein citizens must allow the government into their homes via electronic means without a warrant. And people not litigants could watch without allowing the government into their homes via electronic means as well.

When I contacted the committee on 23 FEB 22 about the Fourth Amendment prohibitions on requiring people to allow for electronic access into people's homes the committee noted that there is no other way to give in-person testimony other than such a person to toss aside that person's Fourth Amendment rights and allow the state into their house via electronic means. Many people are not willing to toss aside their Fourth Amendment rights so the committee has created a process, subject to Fourteenth Amendment protections, that violate both the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments. Why? Because they think that rights never existed. One cannot be required to give up one right to exercise another. It is presumed the committee knows this.

The committee is not subject to any constitutional provisions specific to its meetings but is required to follow the provisions of the FOI Act in this respect, and here, at CGS Sec. 1-206, is where one finds that limiting public attendance is punishable by only one thing, voiding the action of the agency. This is a law that was created by the legislature. Any executive order cannot void a constitutional right so the committee's poor choices that require citizens to toss aside their Fourth and Fourth Amendment rights is not lawful. And unlawfully violates FOIA. 100% certain that the committee and its members don't care as they have demonstrated already that they think that they can make rules that they know violate the rights of citizens.

## CONCLUSION

And for the last three sessions of the general assembly have been conducting business without authority. For the assembly to act, they must allow public attendance; not allowing public attendance results in any action done being unlawful and automatically void. No court decision is needed for citizens to act. As members of a jury, the people decide what the law is and, at this time, its impossible for a citizen to know what is and is not the law. I suggest that citizens utilize the right of nullification and nullify laws in the jury box. This may include nullifying all laws since the laws have been so soiled by the unlawful actions of the general assembly and their legislative committees. After 3 years of committees and the general assembly violating the United States and State constitutions it is perfectly reasonable that when sitting in a jury box to say "not guilty" regardless of the merits of a case as citizens are the final arbitrators of the law, not people in Hartford who have drinking parties at the Legislative Office Building's roof. Human history is full of pandemics but yet the people who considered making an exception to the constitutional provisions decided not to make one for a pandemic or health reason so that the committees and legislature of this state could conduct its business in the manner it has been for the past three years. And E. Prescott clearly is willing to toss aside our rights of us citizens to collect a government paycheck that he should not get.

Don't support any bills.